



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**In re Application of:**

Wilson et al.

**Serial No.:** 10/614,917

**Filed:** July 7, 2003

**For:** NON-LOT BASED METHOD FOR  
ASSEMBLING INTEGRATED CIRCUIT  
DEVICES

**Confirmation No.:** 7872

**Examiner:** B. Werner

**Group Art Unit:** 2624

**Attorney Docket No.:** 2269-3247.4US  
(97-0254.04/US)

**Notice of Allowance Mailed:**

June 30, 2006

NOTICE OF EXPRESS MAILING

Express Mail Mailing Label Number: EV 826302654 US

Date of Deposit with USPS: August 25, 2006

Person making Deposit: Wendy Neff

**TRANSMITTAL LETTER**

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants submit herewith Part B - Fee(s) Transmittal for the above-captioned application and a check in the amount of \$1,715.00 in payment therefor plus five (5) copies of the patent when issued.

Also enclosed are Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance (3 pages); and Fee Addressee for Receipt of PTO Notices Relating to Maintenance Fees (2 pages).

Applicants understand that no additional fees are required. However, if the Office determines that any comparison fees or other additional fees are required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fees to TraskBritt Deposit Account No. 20-1469. A copy of this Transmittal Letter is enclosed for deposit account charging purposes.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan  
Registration No. 28,393  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: August 25, 2006

JRD/nj:lmh

Enclosures: Part B - Issue Fee Transmittal  
Check No. 23124 in the amount of \$1,715.00  
Copy of Transmittal Letter  
Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance (3 pages)  
Fee Addressee for Receipt of PTO Notices Relating to Maintenance Fees (2 pages)

Document in ProLaw



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**In re Application of:**

Wilson et al.

**Serial No.:** 10/614,917

**Filed:** July 7, 2003

**For:** NON-LOT BASED METHOD FOR  
ASSEMBLING INTEGRATED CIRCUIT  
DEVICES

**Confirmation No.:** 7872

**Examiner:** B. Werner

**Group Art Unit:** 2624

**Attorney Docket No.:** 2269-3247.4US  
(97-0254.04/US)

**Notice of Allowance Mailed:**

June 30, 2006

NOTICE OF EXPRESS MAILING

Express Mail Mailing Label Number: EV 826302654 US

Date of Deposit with USPS: August 25, 2006

Person making Deposit: Wendy Neff

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Mail Stop ISSUE FEE  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication is filed in response to the Notice of Allowance mailed June 20, 2006 and sets forth Applicant's comments, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e), on the Examiner's Statement of Allowable Subject Matter accompanying the Office Action dated April 29, 2005.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates:

Independent claims 1 and 11 recite the distinguishing features of:

correlating an ID code of an integrated circuit with a substantially unique ID code of the substrate upon which the circuit is mounted,

assembling the circuits in multiple lots, and

associating assembly data with the substantially unique ID code.

These limitations are not suggested by the prior art, and allow for the “processing of IC devices without regard to lots, and thus substantially eliminates the inefficiencies associated with the conventional lot-based tracking methods” and “provides a more reliable tracking method” as described at specification paragraph 0019. The most pertinent prior art Shills et al. (US 4,510,673 A – art of record) provides an IC circuit with a unique ID for tracking through production. However, Shills does not correlate the ID with a unique ID marked on mounting substrate, among other claimed features. Jernigan (US 5,642,307 A – new art) teaches a method of marking a device package by hand with a lot number, wafer number and die position (figure 2). However, Jernigan does not disclose a substantially unique ID, among other claimed features.

Applicants concur with the reasons as stated by the Examiner insofar as they comprise a summary, which is exemplary and not limiting. However, the scope of the claims is based on the actual language of the claims and equivalents thereof, and not on a paraphrase or summary of the claim language.

The Independent claims as allowed recite features and methodology in addition to, and in different language than, those described in the Statement of Allowable Subject Matter. Furthermore, the dependent claims recite elements in addition to those of the independent claims, which are also not reflected in the Statement of Allowable Subject Matter. Such additional elements, in combination with those of the independent claims from which each claim depends, provide additional reasons for patentability. Accordingly, the scope of the claims must be determined from the literal language of each as a whole, as well as all equivalents thereof.

Therefore, to the extent that the Examiner’s reasons for allowance as stated are not relevant to, or wholly encompassing of, a particular claim, independent or dependent, Applicants assume that (pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e)) the Examiner has determined that the record of the prosecution as a whole of the application makes clear the reasons for allowing those claims.

Further, it appears, pursuant to M.P.E.P. 1302.14, that the Examiner's Statements of Allowable Subject Matter are not intended to encompass all of the reasons for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan  
Registration No. 28,393  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: August 25, 2006

JRD/ps:lmh

Document in ProLaw